

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-50 in the application. In previous responses, the Applicants amended Claims 1, 3-4, 8-10, 21, 28, 30, 39, 41, 45 and 49-50 and added Claims 51-52. In the present preliminary amendment, the Applicants have amended Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-11, 17, 20-22, 26, 28-31, 33, 37, 40-41 45-47 and 49. No claims have been canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1-52 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-52 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-52 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,112,183 to Swanson, *et al.* (Swanson). The Applicants respectfully disagree since Swanson does not teach or suggest a data processing system implemented method for managing data of an enterprise network that includes a plurality of ancillary systems and an enterprise data processing system having an enterprise database as recited in independent Claims 1 and 21, or the enterprise data processing system as recited in independent Claim 41. More specifically, Swanson does not teach or suggest determining whether data stored in an ancillary system is accessible for real-time processing into a value that has been requested and retrieving the data from either the ancillary system or the enterprise database based on whether the data stored in the ancillary system is accessible for real-time processing into the requested value. (See Claims 1, 21 and 41.)

Swanson provides an interface to retrieve health care transaction information and, more, specifically, is directed to processing health care transactions through a common interface in a distributed computing environment. (See column 1, lines 8-12 and the Abstract.) Swanson teaches

the distributed environment includes networked systems 12 having servers and subsystems. (See column 3, lines 38-44, column 4, lines 42-56 and Figures 1A, 1B and 2.) A communication interface 22 provides a mechanism for communication in the networked systems 12. (See column 4, lines 18-19.)

Swanson does not teach or suggest determining if data stored in an ancillary system is accessible for real-time processing into a value of a data item as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 21 and 41. Instead, Swanson teaches that a value is returned based on determining if input parameters are satisfied. (See column 5, line 66 to column 6, line 6 and column 7, lines 8-14.) Accordingly, Swanson suggests that even if data is not accessible for real-time processing into a requested value but satisfies the input parameters, then the value will be returned. Swanson, therefore, suggests that no determination of accessibility for real-time processing is needed when returning a value. Thus, Swanson also does not teach or suggest retrieving the value that is requested based on such a determination. Swanson, therefore, does not teach or suggest each and every element of amended independent Claims 1, 21 and 41.

For at least the reasons stated above, Swanson fails to teach or suggest the invention recited in independent Claims 1, 21 and 41 and Claims dependent thereon. Claims 1-52, therefore, are not obvious in view of Swanson. Thus, Claims 1-52 are not unpatentable in view of Swanson. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-52 and allow issuance thereof.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-52.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.



J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: 4/4/05

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800